DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 607 CE 059 000

AUTHOR Geistfeld, Loren V.
TITLE Report and Analysis of the Pilot Test of the Career Orientation Planning Profile (COPP).
INSTITUTION Career, Education, and Training Associates, Inc., Columbus, OH.
PUB DATE 1 Sep 91
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Choice; Career Guidance; *Career Planning; Intermediate Grades; *Pilot Projects; *Profiles; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Self Concept; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; Kentucky; Mississippi; Missouri; New Hampshire; Oklahoma; South Carolina; Virginia

ABSTRACT

An analysis was made of individual perceptions, implementation issues, costs, and benefits associated with the eight-state pilot of the Career Orientation Planning Profile (COPP) conducted in May-June 1991. Twenty-seven schools from eight states participated in the pilot project, administered to 1,247 students from grades 6 through 12. Respondents to the evaluation questionnaire included 27 teachers, 18 guidance counselors, 15 principals, 6 state department staff, and 11 trainers. Most respondents felt that COPP helps students learn more about themselves, increases their sensitivity to experiences, improves communication with teachers/counselors, and facilitates career planning. Most felt that COPP should be part of career education/guidance programs, and they would encourage others to use it. Suggested modifications included the following: (1) restructuring the training process to motivate the use of COPP and make better use of audiovisual materials; (2) revising the instruments to make them easier to use and more relevant to students; and (3) stressing the benefits of COPP when introducing the program. (Three appendices, which make up over half of this document, are included: (1) schools and states providing input for the evaluation--Arizona, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia; (2) the questionnaire with numbers of responses; and (3) selected comments on subjective question related to COPP materials and process changes.) (NLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336607

Report and Analysis of the Pilot Test of the Career Orientation Planning Profile (COPP)

Prepared by

Loren V. Geistfeld, Ph.D.

Career, Education, and Training Associates, Inc.

1236 Langston Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43220

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H Drier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

September 1, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE059000

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SETTING 2

RESULTS OF THE COPP PILOT 4

BENEFITS/OUTCOMES 9

IMPLICATIONS 13

RECOMMENDATIONS 15

CONCLUSION 16

APPENDICES

A. Pilot Schools 17
B. Evaluation Data Base 18
C. Selective Reviewer/User Comments 42

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of the eight state pilot implementation of the *Career Orientation Planning Profile* (COPP) is an important aspect of the pilot project. Evaluation provides the foundation upon which future discussions and activities related to the COPP can be based. These range from instrument adaption to increasing suitability to an American audience to an assessment of the cost effectiveness of the COPP relative to other currently used vocational guidance programs/techniques.

The evaluation results in documentation of student, teacher, guidance counselor, principal, state department and trainer reactions to the COPP; it identifies ways to administer the COPP as well as applications of the COPP as a pedagogical and guidance instrument; appropriateness of the COPP to an American audience is assessed; costs (both money and non-money) and benefits of the COPP are examined; and the extent to which the COPP fits into educational philosophies, programs, objectives, plans, and requirements are examined.

Careful consideration of the preceding issues will encourage and facilitate efforts to adopt and implement the COPP on a broad scale. This evaluation answers many of the questions that potential adopters might raise.

The evaluation is focused on an analysis of individual perceptions, implementation issues, costs and benefits, etc. associated with the eight-state pilot of the COPP. The pilot was conducted in May/June 1991. Twenty-seven schools from eight states participated in the pilot which was administered to 1247 students from grade six to twelve with a few at the college level.[1]

It is important that readers appreciate the high likelihood that the respondents provided accurate responses to the questions. There was no evidence that any respondent arbitrarily circled responses to the questions. A second factor supporting the quality of the data is that the respondents are types of individuals prone to take such tasks seriously. In addition two-thirds of the students indicated that the student questionnaire allowed them to adequately evaluate the COPP.

The remainder of this report is divided into five sections. **(1) Setting**. This section contains an overview of students, teachers, guidance counselors, and schools participating in the COPP pilot project. **(2) Results** of the Pilot Project. This section consists of an analysis of the data. It will consist of three subsections. In the first subsection the issues surrounding the administration and implementation of the pilot will be addressed. The second subsection focuses on the benefits and outcomes of the COPP. In the third subsection participant assessment and evaluation of the COPP are considered. **(3) Implications** and Recommendations. Salient points from the Results section are summarized and discussed in this section. The section will conclude with a set of recommendations for further development and general implementation of the COPP. **(4) Conclusion**. This section provides a brief summary of the evaluation results.

---

[1] A complete listing of the participating schools and states is contained in Appendix A.

SETTING

Students, teachers, guidance counselors, principals, state department staff and trainers were asked to complete a questionnaire to provide the data needed to evaluate the COPP pilot project. The number of respondents for each group is: students (1247), teachers (27), guidance counselors (18), principals (15), state department staff (6) and trainers (11).

About one-half of the students were born since 1976 making the median student age 14-15 years which is consistent with the fact that over half of the students completing the COPP were in grades seven through nine. Students participating in the COPP ranged from grade 6 through college. There were essentially equal numbers of female and male students.

Eighty-six percent of the students completed the COPP in a class setting with 34% of these classes being a language arts class and 17% being a social studies class. Only five percent of the students did not consider English to be their first language. Ninety-three percent of the students considered themselves to be at least from a middle income family. About one-half indicated that at least one parent or guardian had at least attended college. Only eight percent indicated that no parent or guardian completed high school. One-third of the students classified themselves as generally receiving C/B grades with the same proportion classifying themselves as generally receiving A/B grades.

The average number of years of experience reported by teachers was 9.6 with half reporting eight years or less experience. They taught their current grade level for an average of 6.7 years with half being at the particular grade level for five years or less. They tended to see their students as being split between middle and lower income families with a slight tendency towards lower income. They administered the COPP to groups of 38.7 students on the average with half of the groups being above 40. They indicated that over 80% of the time the COPP was administered in a class setting with language arts/English/reading being the most frequent class setting followed by career awareness/self-development classes. Students scored the COPP in more than 50% of the cases.

Guidance counselors reported an average of 12.9 years experience as counselors with half having been in this role for nine years or less. They indicated that students tended to more frequently come from lower income families than from other income groups. They tended to administer the COPP in a group or class setting to an average group size of 41.1 with half of the groups exceeding 46. They generally used social studies/economics/government classes, language arts/English/reading classes and vocational education classes. They reported that either they or students scored the COPP.

Principals indicated that the average number of students in their buildings was 741.5 with the median being 410 students. They reported a strong tendency for students to come from lower income backgrounds. While one principal indicated responsibility for grades K-8, most were responsible for grades 6-12 with the breakdown depending upon the structure used in the particular system.

Students, teachers, counselors and principals generally agreed as to the environment in which the COPP pilot project was implemented. The only major deviation between groups

is reported income. Reported family income group declined as one goes from student reporting to teacher reporting to counselor reporting to principal reporting. It is not unusual for such a discrepancy since researchers have found that individuals tend to have a bias to report themselves as being middle income. If income class is over reported, it appears as if educational attainment of parents is also over reported.

In summary, the typical pilot project student was in grades seven through nine, took the COPP in a class setting and self-scored the COPP. The COPP tended to be administered to groups of about 40 students. Teachers who administered the COPP, while young, were experienced Guidance counselors, in addition to previous teaching experience, tended to have more than ten years experience as a counselor.

RESULTS OF THE COPP PILOT PROJECT[2]

Administration/Implementation of the COPP

Approval/Cooperation

As one contemplates future COPP related activities, it is helpful to examine issues/problems/concerns experienced when soliciting teacher, guidance counselor, school building, and school system participation in the pilot project. When principals were asked *what motivated them to use the COPP in their school*, 31% indicated that the motivating factor was that the COPP was a pilot, another 31% indicated that there were unique aspects such as the focus on experiences that motivated the decision, and 23% indicated that it was the encouragement of the guidance counselor that motivated the decision.

Seventy-nine percent of the principals indicated that they encountered no problems **getting district/system approval** while 14% indicated the district/system requested that a particular school participate in the pilot. When asked about **problems encountered obtaining teacher/guidance counselor cooperation for the pilot,** two-thirds of the principals indicated no problems were encountered while 20% indicated resistance was encountered due to lateness in the academic year. (The pilot was generally conducted in the last 4-6 weeks of the 90-91 academic year.) State department staff generally indicated no problems were encountered getting district/system cooperation with those encountering problems indicating the cause was lateness in the academic year.

In general, few problems were encountered getting the cooperation of the various parties for the COPP pilot. The only significant problem reported by the respondents was conducting the pilot study late in the academic year.

Training

Since the COPP was new to the schools participating in the pilot project, it was necessary to conduct formal training sessions for those actually administering the COPP to students. State level training was done by individuals trained at a national training activity held in March 1991. Should the COPP be implemented on a broad basis, it will be necessary to conduct training activities making it important that training activities associated with the pilot project are considered.

At least 60% of the teachers, counselors or principals indicated agreement or strong agreement when asked if **sufficient time was devoted to training.**[3] This perception is

---

[2] The questions and responses underlying this section are listed in detail in Appendix B.

[3] When reporting responses to a Likert-type scale, only the percent of respondents indicating agree or strongly agree with a positive statement or disagree or strongly disagree with a negative statement will be reported. In general if 45% or more of the respondents indicate the above responses, it will be viewed as support for the statement. This could be viewed as a stringent test since the version of the COPP used in the pilot was not specifically designed for an American audience. It is likely that in situations as this one would

(continued...)

supported by the fact that 60% of the trainers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **they had adequate time to do an acceptable job of training.**

When asked if **training materials were appropriate**, 62% of the teachers, 66% of the counselors, and 73% of the principals indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statement. The trainers were less sanguine with 60% indicating agreement with a statement that **trainees had little difficulty understanding the COPP instruments**.

Teachers, guidance counselors, principals, state department staff, and trainers were all asked to indicate **what improvements should be considered for COPP training**. When all respondents were combined, the top issue was that training should last more than one day (17%), that trainers should be better prepared/qualified (12%), and that self-training is not a viable alternative (12%). When focusing on particular groups of participants, the suggestions did not appear in the same order. The top three improvements suggested by teachers were that more emphasis should be placed on interpretation of the COPP output (22%), that trainers should be better prepared/qualified (22%), and that training should be no more than one day (19%). (This last point could reflect the COPP being piloted late in the academic year.) Guidance counselors' suggestions were that there should be a better use of audio-visual materials (19%), that training should last more than one day (15%), that there should be greater emphasis on the forms and how to complete them (15%), and that self-training is not viable (15%). Principals indicated that training should be more than one day (38%), that self-training is not viable (25%), and that the training should occur earlier in the academic year (25%). State department staff suggested that training should be more than one day (27%), that the training sessions need better structure/format (18%), and that self-training is not viable (18%). Trainers suggested that training should last more than one day (26%), that training sessions need better structure/format (21%), and that there needs to be better use of audio-visual materials (16%).

In addition to the above question trainers were asked **what specific recommendations they had that would improve efforts to train individuals to administer the COPP**. The highest ranking recommendation (33%) was that training should start with the output and then go through the process that leads up to the output. The second most significant recommendation (22%) was that more detailed, step-by-step instructions for administration of the COPP should be provided.

In summary, respondents feel that future training efforts activities should last about two days and that they should be held earlier in the academic year. There is a sense that trainers need to be more comfortable with the COPP, that it would be better to start training with the output and then work back to how the output was developed, and that there needs to be better use of audio-visual materials when providing training. Lastly, it appears that there is a sense that self-training is not a viable approach to the training process.

---

[3](...continued)
encounter many neutral responses since individuals may like an idea but not how it is carried out--something that can be corrected through revision of the COPP.

Process/Instrument

Time/Cost. When asked *what problems do you perceive with use of the COPP,* 66% of the state department staff commented that the primary problem or one of the primary problems was the time involved in administering the COPP. This perception was supported by the trainers where 40% agreed with the statement that **the COPP takes too long to administer**. A similar question was posed to teachers, counselors, and principals. Sixty percent of this group indicated that **the COPP takes too much time to administer**. When asked to indicate why they felt this way, 32% of the teachers said that the administration process took too many class periods to complete with another 21% indicating the cause of the time problem was the complexity of the COPP instruments. Nearly half of the guidance counselors indicated that complexity was the cause of the time problem. Principals were essentially split between believing the COPP consumed too many class periods (42%) and the complexity issue (42%).

When asked *what they perceived to be the costs of the COPP,* well over one-half of all respondents indicated that time was an important cost with financial concerns being a distant second in importance. This perception was clearly the dominant perception for teachers, counselors, state department staff and trainers. However, principals considered financial costs to be as important as time costs.

Sixty percent of the state department staff either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that **the COPP is too costly for school districts/systems to adopt**. This perception was supported by principals and state department staff responses to a query as to whether **the COPP is less costly to implement that other career guidance programs**. All of the principals either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement while 66% of state department staff were positively inclined towards the statement.

In summary, there is strong evidence that the primary implementation cost of the COPP is time. As will be reinforced later in this evaluation, efforts must be made to reduce the time needed to implement the COPP. However, it is possible that individuals may have been particularly sensitive to the time issue since the pilot was administered during the last few weeks of the academic year.

Complexity/Understandability. Nearly 80% of the students indicated **the COPP was easy to take**. Fewer students (68%) indicated **the COPP was easy to understand**. The finding that fewer students perceived the COPP to be understandable was reinforced by more than one-half of teacher-counselor-principal combination indicating that their **students found the COPP difficult to understand**. They (71%) indicated that the cause of this problem was forms that were too complex or confusing. When asked if **the COPP instruments were not difficult to understand**, 48% of the teachers, 61% of the counselors and 46% of the principals disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. However, the philosophy of the COPP was more easily comprehended. Nearly 70% of the teacher-counselor-principal combination indicated they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement **that they had little difficulty understanding the COPP philosophical orientation**.

Forty-five percent of the teachers provided positive responses to the statement that **the COPP uses terminology appropriate to their students** with 35% of the counselors providing

similar responses. When asked if **the COPP employs a vocabulary appropriate to their students**, 48% of the teachers and 35% of the counselors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Fourteen percent of the teacher-counselor-principal combination indicated that **the COPP would present few difficulties for students speaking a language other than English in the home environment**. When asked *if the COPP would present few difficulties for students considered to be "at-risk"*, 44% of the teachers, 34% of the counselors, and 50% of the principals agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirty-two percent of the teachers, 22% of the counselors and 42% of the principals agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **the COPP presented few difficulties for students having learning disabilities**.

In brief, it is not surprising that students respond more positively to understanding the COPP than did the others. Students are likely responding to the result of the process while teachers, counselors and principals are likely responding to the process used to achieve student understanding. The bottom line is that the instrument appears to be somewhat difficult to understand. This is supported by the fact that more than 40% of the teacher-counselor combination felt the COPP uses terminology inappropriate to their students. It is also clear that there are concerns about how well the COPP would work with "special" students.

Instrument Content. Seventy-eight percent of the students indicated that **the COPP included the types of careers or jobs in which they were most interested**. In response to the statement that **the COPP reflects a sufficiently broad range of career choices**, 81% of the teachers and 84% of the counselors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. When asked to comment on the issue of proficiencies or skills, 66% of the teachers and 94% of the counselors indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statement that **the COPP incorporates a sufficiently broad range of occupational proficiencies and technical skill**. Nearly 75% of all respondents indicated agreement strong agreement with the statement that **the COPP is racially, ethnically and gender neutral**. In general, the sense is that the content of the COPP is adequate with occupational proficiencies or technical skills being a small concern which could be caused by the terminology issue noted earlier.

Implementation Process. Seventy-two percent of the students indicated they **liked the part of the COPP in which the teacher or a friend rated them and they were able to compare the results**. Teachers and especially guidance counselors expressed similar reactions to this process. Fifty percent of the teachers and 83% of the guidance counselors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **the COPP use of teacher or peer rating of students is useful**. Fifty-six percent of the students indicated that **the results of the COPP were shared**. It is likely this would have been higher if the pilot had been conducted earlier in the year since time pressures at the close of the school year may have prevented sharing COPP output with students. Half of the students indicated that they **would like further help in using the results of the COPP**. In general, the responses suggest the implementation process is acceptable.

Considerations for Future Efforts to Implement the COPP. Principals suggested that **activities to facilitate the receipt of cooperation and permission for future efforts to pilot and implement the COPP** include making administrators, boards of education, teachers, guidance counselors, etc. aware of the benefits of the COPP (33%) and to make sure that

sufficient time is allowed for adequate planning (22%). State department staff suggested that the most important element to **facilitate the receipt of cooperation and permission for future efforts to pilot and implement the COPP** is to highlight the desirable aspects of the COPP (50%).

When asked *what is a reasonable cost per student for materials, scoring, etc. if the COPP were implemented on a large scale*, 35% of the principals and 60% of the state department staff indicated $2.00 or less; however, 43% of the principals indicated that they had no clear idea as to what would be a reasonable cost.

Sixty-four percent of the principals indicated that a class setting was the **best way to use the COPP**. The primary reason (62%) was that this setting is more cost effective and consumes less time than alternative approaches. Forty-one percent of the teachers, 65 percent of the counselors, 53 percent of the principals and 67% of the state department staff indicated that **the COPP should be given to students more than once**. The overwhelming (73%) reasons for this belief were that students change through intellectual development and career experiences over time, and that it is important to assess progress or change over time. Respondents expressed the sentiment (37%) that grades six through ten with emphasis on seven through nine were **grade levels for which the COPP is best suited**; however, there is a sense that it is appropriate at any time between grades 7 and 12. The primary reasons these grade levels are appropriate is that the degree of intellectual development, maturity and number of experiences are such that the COPP would be useful (41% of all respondents) and that the COPP would be helpful for career/course planning at these times.

Perhaps the most significant question in the evaluation was *what improvements would be suggested for future uses of the COPP*. The most frequent response (28%), based on all respondents, was that the form, format, and content of the COPP must be improved. The second most frequent response (25%) was that the scoring procedure must be improved to make it less time intensive. The third most frequent suggestion (13%) was that ways must be found to enhance the interpretation of the output or data.[4]

In summary, if the COPP is to be successfully implemented, efforts must be taken to stress the benefits of the COPP. Implementation costs should be kept to $2.00 or less per student. The COPP should be structured to be given in class; however, students should take the COPP more than once. The COPP could be administered for the first time in grades eight or nine before students enter high school/senior high school and again in grades 11 or 12. However, for the COPP to achieve its potential it must be improved with respect to format and scoring. These two elements create much confusion thereby consuming too much time when students take the COPP.

[4] Specific comments made by teachers, counselors and principals are listed in Appendix C.

Perceived Benefits/Outcomes

It was noted above that the benefits of the COPP need to be stressed if the COPP is to be widely adopted. This section focuses on the benefits reported by the various participants in the pilot study. Benefits will be divided into direct benefits or those received directly by students, and indirect benefits or those received by students through others. However, before discussing specific benefits it is appropriate to consider generic benefits of the COPP.

When asked if *the COPP was motivating to students*, 39% of the teachers and 61% of the counselors responded positively to the statement. Eight percent of the principals (with 77% being neutral) and 80% of the state department staff responded positively to the statement that **the COPP provides greater benefits than other career guidance programs**. In response to the statement, *"In general, what are the benefits of the COPP?"*, all respondents combined indicated that increased self-awareness, self-knowledge, etc. (26%), better planning by students (24%), and increased sensitivity to the importance of experiences (24%) were the leading benefits of the COPP.

Direct Benefits

Career Planning. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers, 78% of the counselors, 86% of the principals, 100% of state department staff, and 90% of the trainers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **the COPP is a useful tool for students when selecting a career or future course of study**. In a slightly different version of the same question, **the COPP is a useful tool when helping students with career planning**, 77% of the teacher-counselor-principal-state department combination agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Fifty-seven percent of the students indicated that **the COPP helped identify the careers best for them**. (This response rate should be set in the context that the COPP results had not been shared with 44% of the students.)
When asked *if the COPP facilitates improved career planning by students*, 50% of the teachers, 78% of the counselors, 93% of the principals and 100% of state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. However, responses were not quite as positive to the statement that **the COPP facilitates improved career choice by students**. Forty-five percent of the teachers, 62% of the counselors, 53% of the principals, and 100% of the state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. A possible cause for the difference is that improved career choice at the ages of most students in the pilot is not possible to assess since they have not entered the labor force.

Course Selection. There was a sense across the teacher-counselor-principal-state department combination that **the COPP encourages student participation in vocational programming** with 63% of this group agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement. When asked *if the COPP facilitates improved course selection by students*, 37% of the teachers, 67% of the counselors, 73% of the principals, and 100% of state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Knowledge/Self-awareness. Sixty-one percent of the students indicated that **the COPP encouraged them to look for more information about jobs and careers.** When asked *if the COPP facilitates improved knowledge of career opportunities for students*, 60% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Seventy-eight percent of the teachers, 89% of the counselors, 93% of the principals, and 84% of the state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **the COPP facilitates clarification of student's self-knowledge.** When asked *if the COPP facilitates clarification of student's aspirations*, 53% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Experiences. Two-thirds of the students indicated that **the COPP helped them to identify previous work tryout experiences**, and 73% indicated that **the profile of the careers most closely related to their work tryout experiences will be useful in the future.** When asked whether **the COPP encourages students to seek meaningful work experiences**, 55% of the teachers, 66% of the counselors, 66% of the principals and 67% of state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Summary. There is no strong indication that the COPP "turned students off" and that the COPP is any less effective than other career education/ guidance programs. This is encouraging since these responses were to a pilot project and not the final product. Respondents clearly see improved student self-awareness as an important benefit of the COPP. They also see the focus on experiences as an important benefit of the COPP. There is a sense among respondents that the COPP is a useful planning tool.

Indirect Benefits

Career Education/Guidance. Eighty-three percent of state department staff see **the COPP as improving guidance activities, providing more information to guidance activities or adding to the set of career education/guidance program choices.** However, it is important to note that 94% of the principals **do not see the COPP as a tool that is useful only for counselors.** When responding to a question asking *if the COPP is useful as a career education method/pedagogical tool*, 63% of the teachers, 89% of the counselors, 86% of the principals, 100% of the state department staff, and 60% of the trainers agreed or strongly agreed. Teachers, counselors and principals as a group when asked *in what ways do you perceive the COPP changing your current career education programs*, indicated that it will improve guidance activities (21%), encourage more emphasis on self-analysis, self-evaluation, self-awareness of the part of students (19%), and encourage students to seek additional experiences. It is worth noting that only 21% see no or few changes being made to their career education programs based on the pilot project.

Communication. Forty-eight percent of the teachers, 61% of the counselors, 80% of the principals, and 100% of state department staff agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that **the COPP improved communication between and among students and teachers/counselors.** When asked *if the COPP processes and results will help them personalize future interaction with students*, 51% of the teachers and 89% of the counselors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Summary. There is a clear sense among respondents that the COPP is a viable career education/guidance tool. A significant number of respondents (nearly 80%) see the COPP changing their current career education program. The COPP is also perceived as a tool that enhances communication with students and helps to personalize interaction with them.

Assessment/Evaluation of the COPP

The ultimate reaction to any program is the user's overall reaction to it. While users may have questions about the specifics of a program, it is their overall impression that affects the likelihood of future use. General reactions are often best assessed indirectly by asking how a program fits into a particular structure, whether it will or should be used again, and if others should be encouraged to use it.

Compatibility with Approach or Orientation

When asked *how well the COPP fits into current career education/guidance plans and activities*, 27% of the teachers, 61% of the counselors and 73% of the principals responded positively to the statement. Twenty-three percent of the teachers, 55% of the counselors, and 74% of the principals provided positive responses to a query as to whether *the COPP fits well into the model used by their school to guide the career education/guidance program*. In response to a question as to *ways the COPP does or does not fit into their school's career education/guidance plans*, 69% of the principals indicated that they see possible or definite roles for the COPP in their plans. At a slightly different level, 80% of state department staff provided positive responses to a question as to whether *the COPP is consistent with state career education requirements*.

Future Use of COPP

Forty-three percent of the students indicated they **would be interested in taking the COPP again**. When asked if they would be **willing to make the COPP an ongoing part of their career education/guidance activities or programming**, 53% of the teachers, 72% of the counselors, 46% of the principals, and 100% of the state department staff provided positive responses.

Encourage Use by Others

Two-thirds of the students said they would **recommend that all students take the COPP in the future**. When asked if they would **encourage a colleague to use the COPP**, 63% of the teachers, 78% of the counselors, 57% of the principals, and 100% of the state department staff were positive. Principals and trainers were asked if they **would encourage teachers/guidance counselors to use the COPP**. Fifty percent of the principals and 90% of the trainers made positive responses to the statement. From a somewhat different perspective 87% of the principals and 100% of the state department staff support the idea that **the COPP is an appropriate topic for inservice education**. Fifty percent of the

principals were positive with respect to the statement that they would **encourage the state department to support and encourage the use of the COPP**, and 100% of the state department staff indicated agreement with the statement that it would **be appropriate to encourage future use of the COPP by school systems in their states**. State department staff were also in 100% agreement with the idea that **school systems will find that the COPP is an important and useful career education tool**.

Summary

Respondents believe that the COPP is generally consistent (or at least not inconsistent) with current career education practices and models. Generally, respondents would consider making the COPP a part of their career education/guidance program. Perhaps the strongest endorsement of the COPP is the small number of respondents who would be unwilling to encourage others to take the COPP. In general, principals and state department staff are not pessimistic about the role of the COPP in their state's career education/ guidance program.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications to be drawn from an analysis of the COPP evaluation data can be summarized into the following points:

1. Few problems were encountered getting approval to participate in the pilot project and getting the cooperation of key personnel.

2. The pilot project was implemented too late in the academic year.

3. Training needs to be accomplished over a two day period.

4. Trainers need to be better qualified.

5. The structure of the training process needs to be reconsidered.

6. The training process should make more extensive use of audio-visual materials.

7. The most significant cost associated with implementing the COPP during the pilot project was time.

8. The COPP instruments are too complex and used unfamiliar terminology.

9. The COPP scoring process needs to be simplified.

10. While the career choices in the COPP are adequate, there is some need to make experiences and technical skills more relevant to American students.

11. The cost of the COPP should be no more than $2.00 per student.

12. The COPP should be given more than once. The first time it should be administered is during the transition to high school/senior high school and the second being near the completion of high school.

13. The COPP is perceived as an effective career education/guidance tool.

14. An important benefit of the COPP is enhancing student self-awareness.

15. Another important benefit is the way the COPP highlights the role of and need for experiences.

16. Users also indicated the COPP helped enhance student planning.

17. The COPP is a tool that enhances student and teacher/counselor communication.

18. The COPP helps teachers/counselors individualize interactions with students.

19. The COPP is seen to be an addition to the set of viable career education/guidance tools.

20. The COPP is consistent with current career education/guidance models.

21. There is a sense that others should be encouraged to use the COPP.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the implications drawn from the analysis of the data, the following recommendations emerge:

1. Additional piloting of the COPP should be initiated early in the academic year. Training should occur in the autumn with implementation occurring upon completion of the training and before early spring. Output from the COPP should be made available to students in the spring to coincide with registration for courses for the next academic year.

2. The training process should be structured in a way that motivates use of the COPP. A way to achieve this would be to start the training process with a discussion of the output and then go into how the output is obtained. More time should be spent discussing how the output is to be interpreted and follow-up activities to the COPP. In addition, trainers need to become more familiar and comfortable with the COPP. (This problem will likely solve itself as more individuals become familiar with the COPP. In the pilot many trainers were not significantly more experienced with the COPP than the trainees.) The training process also needs to include better use of audio-visual materials.

3. The COPP instruments need to be revised to make them easier to use. The experiences should be more relevant to American students. The relevancy problem may be partially solved when the terminology of the instrument is improved. The scoring process should be automated to reduce the amount of time it takes.

4. The benefits of the COPP need to be stressed as others are introduced to the program. Key benefits are increased student self-awareness, increased student appreciation of need for and role of experiences, improved student planning, enhanced communication between and among students and teachers/counselors, and information to facilitate individualized interactions with students. It should be noted that users perceive the COPP as a tool consistent with current career education/guidance activities and as a viable tool to be made a part of career education/guidance programs.

5. The COPP should be structured so that the cost per student is no more than $2.00 including computer scoring.

CONCLUSION

There is a sense that the COPP helps students learn more about themselves, that it increases sensitivity to experiences, that it helps teachers/counselors work with students and that it facilitates career planning. This suggests that users, in general, perceive the COPP is beneficial for students.

There is a sense that the COPP is a useful method and that it should be made a part of career education/guidance programs. There is a strong belief that colleagues should be encouraged to use the COPP which is, perhaps, the strongest endorsement of the COPP.

Given the generally positive reaction to the COPP, it is appropriate to consider modifications to the COPP and ways to improve training. The evidence is quite strong that the forms need to be simplified and that scoring needs to be done by machine.

In conclusion, this preliminary analysis of the COPP pilot test suggests the COPP has much potential as a career education/guidance tool. If the pilot had been conducted under a less stressful environment (i.e. earlier in the academic year), it is likely that the evaluation would be even more positive. The COPP clearly warrants revision.

Perhaps the comments by one respondent best illustrate the potential for the COPP.

> Anytime I see students working together, helping each other, asking questions, and anticipating conclusions, about and for themselves, time has been spent constructively....I hope that you will continue to develop this instrument. There are problems in the way the COPP is set up but the result is worth the trouble.

APPENDIX A

Schools and States Providing Input for the Evaluation

Arizona
Gilbert High School
Amphitheatre Junior High School

Kentucky
Bryan Station High School
Lee County AVEC
Nelson County AVEC

Mississippi
Kosciusko Separate School
Lafayette High School

Missouri
Belton High School
Hancock Place Senior High School
Reed Junior High School
Adrian Senior High School
Lex-Le-Ray Technical Center

New Hampshire
C.D. McIntyre School
Interlakes Junior-Senior High School
Salem High School
Plymouth State College

Oklahoma
Southwestern State University
Welston Public Schools
Weatherford Public Schools
Prague Public Schools
Hammon Public Schools

South Carolina
Leavelle-McCampbell Middle School
John Ford Middle School
J.V. Martin Junior High School

Virginia
Eastern Shore
Peabody Middle School
Heritage High School

APPENDIX B

COPP Evaluation Data Base

NOTE: Percents will not always add to 100 due to rounding.

1. What were the unique aspects of Career Orientation Planning Profile that motivated you to use it in your school?

1 = offered as a pilot
2 = counselor encouraged participation
3 = interested in new/alternative approaches
4 = unique aspects of COPP such as experiences
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					4	31					4	31
2					3	23					3	23
3					4	31					4	31
4					2	15					2	15
10												
CASES					13						13	

2. What problems did you encounter in getting district/system approval to pilot the Career Orientation Planning Profile in your school?

1 = none
2 = central office requested that school participate
3 = lateness in academic year
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					11	79					11	79
2					2	14					2	14
3					1	7					1	7
CASES					14						14	

3. What problems did you encounter when trying to obtain teacher/guidance counselor cooperation for the pilot?

1 = none
2 = counselor initiated activity
3 = time/lateness in academic year
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					10	67					10	67
2					1	7					1	7
3					3	20					3	20
10					1	7					1	7
CASES					15						15	

4. What problems did you encounter in getting district/system support to pilot the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = none
2 = lateness in academic year

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1							4	67			4	67
2							2	33			2	33
CASES							6				6	

5. Sufficient time was devoted for training to use the Career Orientation Planning Profile.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	2	8	3	17	2	13					7	12
A	14	56	8	44	7	47					29	50
N	1	4	2	11	1	7					4	7
D	8	32	5	28	4	27					17	29
SD					1	7					1	2
CASES	25		18		15						58	

6. I had adequate time to do an acceptable job of training.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA									4	40	4	40
A									2	20	2	20
N									2	20	2	20
D									2	20	2	20
SD												
CASES									10		10	

7. The training materials were appropriate.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	4	22	3	20					8	12
A	15	58	8	44	8	53			6	60	37	54
N	6	23	5	28					4	40	15	22
D	3	12	1	6	2	13					6	9
SD	1	4			2	13					3	4
CASES	26		18		15				10		69	

8. The trainees had little difficulty understanding the Career Orientation Planning Profile instruments.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA												
A									6	60	6	60
N									1	10	1	10
D									3	30	3	30
SD												
CASES									10		10	

9. What improvements would you suggest be considered for Career Orientation Planning Profile training?

1 = training: 1 day or less
2 = training: more than 1 day
3 = stress forms and completion of instrument more
4 = more emphasis on interpretation of output
5 = more ideas for follow-up activities/more resources
6 = better prepared/qualified trainers
7 = better use of A/V materials
8 = better structure/format of training session
9 = self-training not viable
10 = other
11 = conduct early in school year

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	5	19							2	11	7	8
2	1	4	4	15	3	38	3	27	5	26	16	17
3	1	4	4	15					2	11	7	8
4	6	22	3	11							9	10
5			1	4			1	9	1	5	3	3
6	6	22	2	7	1	13	1	9	1	5	11	12
7	1	4	5	19			1	9	3	16	10	11
8	3	11	1	4			2	18	4	21	10	11
9	3	11	4	15	2	25	2	18			11	12
11					2	25			1	5	3	3
10	1	4	3	11			1	9			5	5
CASES	27		27		8		11		19		92	

10. What specific recommendations do you have that would improve efforts to train individuals to administer the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = start with output and then go through process/ administer COPP and then discuss
2 = more detailed, step-by-step instructions for administrators of COPP
3 = use more A/V materials
4 = have state/regional training
5 = time for training
10 = other
ij = i, first; j, second

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1									3	33	3	33
2									2	22	2	22
3												
4												
5									1	11	1	11
13									1	11	1	11
35									1	11	1	11
10									1	11	1	11
CASES									9		9	

11. What problems do you perceive with use of the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = time involved in administering COPP
2 = willingness to use/attitude toward COPP
3 = problems no different than with similar tools
4 = training of administrators
ij = i, first reason; j, second reason

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1							2	33			2	33
2												
3							1	17			1	17
4							1	17			1	17
12							2	33			2	33
CASES							6				6	

12. The Career Orientation Planning Profile takes too long to administer.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA												
A									4	40	4	40
N									2	20	2	20
D									4	40	4	40
SD												
CASES									10		10	

13. Did the Career Orientation Planning Profile take too much time to administer? Why do you believe this?

1 = yes
2 = no
3 = uncertain

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	19	70	7	41	9	64					35	60
2	6	22	3	18	5	36					14	24
3	2	7	7	41							9	16
CASES	27		17		14						58	

1 = number of class periods/time to complete COPP
2 = complex and/or confusing
3 = results/output not worth time/effort
4 = disruptions, distractions, student frustration
5 = group size
6 = repetition made easier
7 = pilot too late in year
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	8	32	2	13	5	42					15	29
2	8	32	7	47	5	42					20	38
3	2	8									2	4
4	4	16	1	7							5	10
5			2	13							2	4
6	1	4	2	13							3	6
7			1	7							1	2
10	2	8			2	17					4	8
CASES	25		15		12						52	

14. In general, what you perceive to be the costs (financial, time, etc.) of the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = time
2 = financial
3 = uncertain
4 = costs not unreasonable
10 = other
12 = time and money

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	10	50	8	57	5	33	3	75	4	36	30	47
2	3	15	2	14	6	40			1	9	12	19
3	3	15	2	14					1	9	6	9
4					3	20	1	25	2	18	6	9
12	2	10	1	7	1	7			3	27	7	11
10	2	10	1	7							3	5
CASES	20		14		15		4		11		64	

15. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is too costly for school districts/systems to adopt.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA												
A												
N							2	33			2	33
D							1	17			1	17
SD							3	50			3	50
CASES							6				6	

16. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is less costly to implement than other career guidance programs.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA					1	8	2	33			3	17
A					11	92	2	33			13	72
N							1	17			1	6
D							1	17			1	6
SD												
CASES					12		6				18	

17. The Career Orientation Planning Profile was easy to take.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	980	79
No	264	21
CASES	1244	

18. The Career Orientation Planning Profile was easy for me to understand.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	847	68
No	398	32
CASES	1245	

19. Did your students find the Career Orientation Planning Profile difficult to understand? If yes, why did this happen?

1 = yes
2 = no
3 = uncertain

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	15	56	5	31	9	64					29	51
2	9	33	6	38	4	29					19	33
3	3	11	5	31	1	7					9	16
CASES	27		16		14						57	

1 = forms too complex/confusing
2 = directions confusing
3 = scoring too complicated
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	15	79	7	58	8	73					30	71
2	2	11	1	8	1	9					4	10
3			1	8							1	2
10	2	11	3	25	2	18					7	17
CASES	19		12		11						42	

20. The Career Orientation Planning Profile instruments were not difficult to understand.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA					1	7					1	2
A	9	33	4	22	6	40					19	32
N	5	19	3	17	1	7					9	15
D	9	33	8	44	5	33					22	37
SD	4	15	3	17	2	13					9	15
CASES	27		18		15						60	

21. Little difficulty was experienced understanding the Career Orientation Planning Profile philosophical orientation.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	2	7	1	6	1	7			2	20	6	9
A	14	52	13	72	9	60			6	60	42	60
N	3	11	2	11							5	7
D	5	19	2	11	3	20			2	20	12	17
SD	3	11			2	13					5	7
CASES	27		18		15				10		70	

22. The Career Orientation Planning Profile uses terminology appropriate to my students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	1	6							2	5
A	11	41	5	29							16	36
N	4	15	3	18							7	16
D	8	30	7	41							15	34
SD	3	11	1	6							4	9
CASES	27		17								44	

23. The Career Orientation Planning Profile employs a vocabulary appropriate to my students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	1	6							2	5
A	12	44	5	29							17	39
N	6	22	5	29							11	25
D	5	19	5	29							10	23
SD	3	11	1	6							4	9
CASES	27		17								44	

24. The Career Orientation Planning Profile presented few difficulties for students speaking a language other than English in the home environment.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	5	1	6							2	4
A	2	10	2	13	1	7					5	10
N	13	65	13	81	10	71					36	72
D	3	15			2	14					5	10
SD	1	5			1	7					2	4
CASES	20		16		14						50	

25. The Career Orientation Planning Profile presented few difficulties for students considered to be "at-risk."

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	1	6	1	7					3	5
A	10	40	5	28	6	43					21	37
N	6	24	4	22	1	7					11	19
D	4	16	6	33	3	21					13	23
SD	4	16	2	11	3	21					9	16
CASES	25		18		14						57	

26. The Career Orientation Planning Profile presented few difficulties for students having learning disabilities.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4			3	21					4	7
A	7	28	4	22	3	21					14	25
N	5	20	3	17	2	14					10	18
D	7	28	9	50	2	14					18	32
SD	5	20	2	11	4	29					11	19
CASES	25		18		14						57	

27. The Career Orientation Planning Profile included the types of careers or jobs in which I am most interested.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	966	78
No	278	22
CASES	1244	

28. The Career Orientation Planning Profile reflects a sufficiently broad range of career choices.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	5	19	3	17							8	18
A	16	62	12	67							28	64
N	2	8									2	5
D	1	4	3	17							4	9
SD	2	8									2	5
CASES	26		18								44	

29. The Career Orientation Planning Profile incorporates a sufficiently broad range of occupational proficiencies and technical skills.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	2	7	2	11							4	9
A	16	59	15	83							31	69
N	8	30	1	6							9	20
D	1	4									1	2
SD												
CASES	27		18								45	

30. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is racially, ethnically and gender neutral.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15			1	7	3	60	4	40	12	16
A	13	48	14	78	9	64	1	20	5	50	42	57
N	9	33	4	22	4	29					17	23
D	1	4					1	20	1	10	3	4
SD												
CASES	27		18		14		5		10		74	

31. I liked the part of the Career Orientation Planning Profile where the teacher or a friend rated me and we were able to compare the results.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	873	72
No	343	28
CASES	1216	

32. The Career Orientation Planning Profile use of teacher/counselor or peer rating of students is useful.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	6	23	4	22							10	23
A	7	27	11	61							18	41
N	5	19	2	11							7	16
D	8	31	1	6							9	20
SD												
CASES	26		18								44	

33. The results of the Career Orientation Planning Profile were shared with me.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	689	56
No	533	44
CASES	1222	

34. I would like further help in using the results of the Career Orientation Planning Profile.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	620	50
No	621	50
CASES	1241	

35. What suggestions do you have to facilitate the receipt of cooperation and permission for efforts to pilot and implement the Career Orientation Planning Profile in the future?

1 = make others aware of benefits: administrators, Boards of Education, teachers, etc.
2 = market effectively
3 = simplify
4 = allow for adequate planning time
5 = secure financial backing
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					3	33					3	33
2					1	11					1	11
3					1	11					1	11
4					2	22					2	22
5					1	11					1	11
10					1	11					1	11
CASES					9						9	

36. What suggestions do you have to facilitate the receipt of cooperation and permission for future efforts to pilot and implement the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = highlight desirable aspects of COPP, per se
2 = restructure instrument
3 = timing of when administered
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1							3	50			3	50
2							1	17			1	17
3							1	17			1	17
10							1	17			1	17
CASES							6				6	

37. What would you consider to be a reasonable cost per student for materials, scoring, etc. if the Career Orientation Planning Profile were implemented on a large scale?

actual amount
9000 = unsure
9100 = same as similar tools

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
$1.00					3	21	1	20			4	21
$1.50							2	40			2	11
$2.00					2	14					2	11
$2.50							1	20			1	5
$4.00					1	7					1	5
$5.00					1	7					1	5
9000					6	43	1	20			7	37
9100					1	7					1	5
CASES					14		5				19	

38. Is a class setting or one-on-one the best way to use Career Orientation Planning Profile? Why do you believe this?

1 = class
2 = small class
3 = one-on-one
4 = no setting is appropriate

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					9	64					9	64
2					1	7					1	7
3					3	21					3	21
4					1	7					1	7
CASES					14						14	

1 = more cost effective/less time
2 = personal contact with students/individual instruction
3 = allow student interaction
4 = difficult to administer in groups
5 = COPP is too complex
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					8	62					8	62
2					2	15					2	15
3					1	8					1	8
4					1	8					1	8
5					1	8					1	8
10												
CASES					13						13	

39. Should the Career Orientation Planning Profile be given to students more than once? If so, why?

1 = yes
2 = no
3 = uncertain

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	11	41	11	65	8	53	4	67			34	52
2	9	33	3	18	6	40	1	17			19	29
3	7	26	3	18	1	7	1	7			12	18
CASES	27		17		15		6				65	

1 = change, intellectual growth, more experiences
2 = assess progress/compare over time
3 = other profiles are better
4 = COPP too time consuming and/or difficult
5 = need more tangible output
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	13	59	7	54	6	60	2	33			28	55
2	2	9	5	38	1	10	1	17			9	18
3	2	9									2	4
4	3	14			3	30					6	12
5	1	5									1	2
10	1	5	1	8			3	50			5	10
CASES	22		13		10		6				51	

40. For what grade levels is the Career Orientation Planning Profile best suited? Why do you believe this?

1 = grades 6/7 to 8/9
2 = grade 8 or 9
3 = grades 7/8 to 12
4 = grades 6/7 to 10
5 = grades 9 to 12
6 = grades 9 to 10
7 = grades 11 to 12
8 = suitable for no one
9 = undecided
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	2	7	1	6	1	7	2	33			6	9
2	8	30	3	18	5	33	1	17			17	26
3	6	22	4	24	2	13	2	33			14	22
4	2	7	3	18	1	7	1	17			7	11
5	1	4	2	12	2	13					5	8
6	1	4	2	12							3	5
7	4	15	2	12	2	13					8	12
8	1	4			1	7					2	3
9	1	4									1	2
10	1	4			1	7					2	3
CASES	27		17		15		6				65	

1 = intellectual development, maturity, number of experiences
2 = career/course planning
3 = stimulates interest in career planning
4 = assess change
5 = COPP inappropriate or too complex
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	9	43	9	60	2	15	2	40			22	41
2	8	38	3	20	6	46	1	20			18	33
3	2	10			1	8	2	40			5	9
4			2	13	2	15					4	7
5	1	5			2	15					3	6
10	1	5	1	7							2	4
CASES	21		15		13		5				54	

41. What improvements would you suggest be considered for future uses of the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = form format and/or content
2 = scoring
3 = directions
4 = teacher guide
5 = student guide
6 = output/data interpretation
7 = resource materials/follow-up activities
8 = way COPP administered
9 = reduce time
10 = other
11 = spend administration over longer period of time

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	21	34	16	30	9	26	3	14	8	22	57	28
2	12	19	12	23	10	29	6	29	11	31	51	25
3	6	10	4	8	3	9	1	5	4	11	18	9
4	2	3	2	4			1	5	1	3	6	3
5	1	2	2	4			2	10	1	3	6	3
6	6	10	6	11	5	15	4	19	6	17	27	13
7	1	2	2	4	1	3			3	8	7	3
8	8	13	5	9	1	3	2	10	1	3	17	8
9	4	6	2	4	3	9					9	4
11					2	6			1	3	3	1
10	1	2	2	4			2	10			5	2
CASES	62		53		34		21		36		206	

42. The Career Orientation Planning Profile was motivating to students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	2	11							3	7
A	9	35	9	50							18	41
N	6	23	6	33							12	27
D	8	31	1	6							9	20
SD	2	8									2	5
CASES	26		18								44	

43. The Career Orientation Planning Profile provides greater benefits than other career guidance programs.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA							2	40			2	11
A					1	8	2	40			3	17
N					10	77					10	56
D					1	8	1	20			2	11
SD					1	8					1	6
CASES					13		5				18	

44. In general, what do you perceive as the benefits of the Career Orientation Planning Profile?

1 = self awareness, awareness
2 = better planning for future
3 = consideration of alternate careers
4 = appreciate need for and role of experiences
5 = improve counseling
6 = of little or uncertain value
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	7	26	4	24	3	20	1	25	4	36	19	26
2	8	30	2	12	3	20	2	50	3	27	18	24
3	4	15	2	12	3	20			1	9	10	14
4	6	22	7	41	4	27			1	9	18	24
5			1	6	2	13	1	25	2	18	6	8
6	1	4	1	6							2	3
10	1	4									1	1
CASES	27		17		15		4		11		74	

45. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is a useful tool for students when selecting a career or future course of study.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	3	17	2	13	4	67	7	70	20	26
A	14	52	11	61	11	73	2	33	2	20	40	53
N	4	15	2	11					1	10	7	9
D	3	11	2	11	2	13					7	9
SD	2	7									2	3
CASES	27		18		15		6		10		76	

46. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is a useful tool when helping students with career planning.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	5	28	5	33	5	83			19	29
A	13	50	10	56	7	47	1	17			31	48
N	4	15	2	11	3	20					9	14
D	3	12	1	6							4	6
SD	2	8									2	3
CASES	26		18		15		6				65	

47. The Career Orientation Planning Profile helped identify the careers best for me.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	705	57
No	536	43
CASES	1241	

48. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates improved career planning by students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	5	19	2	11	3	20	4	67			14	22
A	8	31	12	67	11	73	2	33			33	51
N	8	31	3	17	1	7					12	18
D	3	12	1	6							4	6
SD	2	8									2	3
CASES	26		18		15		6				65	

49. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates improved career choice by students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	1	6	3	20	2	40			10	15
A	8	30	10	56	8	53	3	60			29	45
N	8	30	5	28	4	27					17	26
D	6	22	2	11							8	12
SD	1	4									1	2
CASES	27		18		15		5				65	

50. The Career Orientation Planning Profile encourages student participation in vocational programming.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	5	28	2	13	2	33			10	15
A	12	44	6	33	10	67	4	67			32	48
N	9	33	7	39	1	7					17	26
D	4	15			2	13					6	9
SD	1	4									1	2
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

51. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates improved course selection by students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	3	11			3	20	3	50			9	14
A	7	26	12	67	8	53	3	50			30	45
N	10	37	5	28	3	20					18	27
D	4	15	1	6	1	7					6	9
SD	3	11									3	5
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

52. The Career Orientation Planning Profile has encouraged me to look for more information about jobs and careers.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	754	61
No	484	39
CASES	1238	

53. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates improved knowledge of career opportunities for students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	3	11			4	27	1	17			8	12
A	11	41	12	67	7	47	3	50			33	50
N	5	19	3	17	4	27	1	17			13	20
D	6	22	3	17			1	17			10	15
SD	2	7									2	3
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

54. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates clarification of student's self-knowledge.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	5	19	6	33	5	33	5	83			21	32
A	16	59	10	56	9	60	1	17			36	55
N	5	19	2	11	1	7					8	12
D												
SD	1	4									1	2
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

55. The Career Orientation Planning Profile facilitates clarification of student's aspirations.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	2	11	2	13	4	67			12	18
A	10	37	8	44	11	73	1	17			30	45
N	9	33	7	39	1	7	1	17			18	27
D	2	7	1	6	1	7					4	6
SD	2	7									2	3
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

56. The Career Orientation Planning Profile helped me to identify my previous work tryout experiences.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	835	67
No	405	33
CASES	1240	

57. The profile of the careers most closely related to my work tryout experiences will be useful to me in the future.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	902	73
No	338	27
CASES	1240	

58. The Career Orientation Planning Profile encourages students to seek meaningful work experiences.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	3	11	4	22	2	13	3	50			12	18
A	12	44	8	44	8	53	1	17			29	44
N	5	19	5	28	3	20	2	33			15	23
D	6	22	1	6	2	13					9	14
SD	1	4									1	2
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

59. In what ways can the Career Orientation Planning Profile enhance your state's career education/guidance program?

1 = improve/provide more information to guidance activities
2 = encourage students to seek experiences
3 = adds to set of useable career education/guidance choices

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1							3	50			3	50
2							1	17			1	17
3							2	33			2	33
CASES							6				6	

60. Is the Career Orientation Planning Profile a tool that is useful only for counselors?

1 = no, students/parent
2 = no, students/teachers
3 = no, teachers and other staff
4 = no, fits into entire curriculum
5 = no, other
6 = yes

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					2	14					2	14
2					2	14					2	14
3					5	36					5	36
4					2	14					2	14
5					2	14					2	14
6					1	7					1	7
CASES					14						14	

61. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is useful as a career education/ guidance method/pedagogical tool.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	6	33	5	33			3	30	18	24
A	13	48	10	56	8	53	6	100	3	30	40	53
N	5	19	1	6	1	7			4	40	11	14
D	4	15	1	6	1	7					6	8
SD	1	4									1	1
CASES	27		18		15		6		10		76	

62. In what ways do you perceive the Career Orientation Planning Profile changing your current career education/guidance programs?

1 = self analysis, self evaluation, awareness
2 = encourage students to seek additional experiences
3 = expose students to career information
4 = stimulates efforts to seek and/or provide career information
5 = improve or provide more information to guidance activities
6 = do not know/unsure
7 = none/little
8 = complementary with current program
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	5	19	4	27	1	8					10	19
2	3	12	3	20							6	11
3	1	4									1	2
4	1	4									1	2
5	3	12	5	33	3	25					11	21
6	2	8	1	7	2	17					5	9
7	7	27	2	13	2	17					11	21
8					4	33					4	8
10	4	15									4	8
CASES	26		15		12						53	

63. The Career Orientation Planning Profile improved communication between and among students and teachers/counselors.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	3	11	2	11	3	20	6	100			14	21
A	10	37	9	50	9	60					28	42
N	8	30	7	39	2	13					17	26
D	5	19			1	7					6	9
SD	1	4									1	2
CASES	27		18		15		6				66	

64. The Career Orientation Planning Profile processes and results will help me personalize future interaction with students.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	2	7	6	33							8	18
A	12	44	10	56							22	49
N	9	33	2	11							11	24
D	4	15									4	9
SD												
CASES	27		18								45	

65. The Career Orientation Planning Profile fits well into my current career education/guidance plans and activities.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	2	8	3	17	2	13					7	12
A	5	19	8	44	9	60					22	37
N	11	42	4	22	2	13					17	29
D	4	15	3	17	2	13					9	15
SD	4	15									4	7
CASES	26		18		15						59	

66. The Career Orientation Planning Profile fits well into the model used by my school to guide the career education/guidance program.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	1	4	4	22	4	27					9	15
A	5	19	6	33	7	47					18	31
N	13	50	6	33	3	20					22	37
D	4	15	2	11	1	7					7	12
SD	3	12									3	5
CASES	26		18		15						59	

67. In what way does or does not the Career Orientation Planning Profile fit into your school career education/guidance plans?

1 = see definite role in plans
2 = see possible role in plans
3 = unlikely to use
4 = very unlikely to use
5 = uncertain
10 = other

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1					3	23					3	23
2					6	46					6	46
3					1	8					1	8
4					2	15					2	15
5					1	8					1	8
CASES					13						13	

68. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is consistent with state career education requirements.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA							3	60			3	60
A							1	20			1	20
N							1	20			1	20
D												
SD												
CASES							5				5	

69. I would be interested in taking the Career Orientation Planning Profile again.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	527	43
No	707	57
CASES	1234	

70. I would be willing to make the Career Orientation Planning Profile an ongoing part of my career education/guidance activities/programming.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	4	15	2	11	2	15	2	33			10	16
A	10	38	11	61	4	31	4	67			29	46
N	3	12	2	11	4	31					9	14
D	5	19	3	17	2	15					10	16
SD	4	15			1	8					5	8
CASES	26		18		13		6				63	

71. I would recommend that all students take the Career Orientation Planning Profile in the future.

	Student	
	n	%
Yes	825	67
No	407	33
CASES	1232	

72. I would encourage a colleague to use the Career Orientation Planning Profile.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA	5	19	3	17	1	7	2	33			11	17
A	12	44	11	61	7	50	4	67			34	52
N	4	15	2	11	5	36					11	17
D	2	7	2	11							4	6
SD	4	15			1	7					5	8
CASES	27		18		14		6				65	

73. I would encourage teachers/guidance counselors to use the Career Orientation Planning Profile.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA					1	7			6	60	7	29
A					6	43			3	30	9	38
N					6	43			1	10	7	29
D												
SD					1	7					1	4
CASES					14				10		24	

74. The Career Orientation Planning Profile is an appropriate topic for inservice education.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA							3	50			3	14
A					13	87	3	50			16	76
N												
D					1	7					1	5
SD					1	7					1	5
CASES					15		6				21	

75. I would encourage the state department to support and encourage the use of the Career Orientation Planning Profile.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA					2	14					2	14
A					5	36					5	36
N					6	43					6	43
D					1	7					1	7
SD												
CASES					14						14	

76. It would be appropriate to encourage future use of the Career Orientation Planning Profile by school systems in my state.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA							3	50			3	50
A							3	50			3	50
N												
D												
SD												
CASES							6				6	

77. School systems will find that the Career Orientation Planning Profile is an important and useful career education tool.

	Teacher		Counselor		Principal		State Dept		Trainer		Combined	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
SA							3	50			3	50
A							3	50			3	50
N												
D												
SD												
CASES							6				6	

APPENDIX C

Selected Comments on Subjective Question Related to COPP Materials and Process Changes

The following comments are those made in sufficient detail as to be helpful in the actual revision of the COPP materials and process. Many individuals indicated that the COPP is too complicated; however, this does not give any clue as to how they felt is could be improved. The intent of this is to expand on the findings in the analysis reported in the body of this preliminary report. The general sense across most respondents is, however, the materials need to be simplified and the scoring needs to be done by machine.

Teachers

Directions that are clearer with fewer detailed examples.

On Form B explain as to how and where the index numbers are found. This should be noted on the form.

Better student guide--more clearly written.

Separate forms so they aren't so long and hard to handle

Lightly shade the subtotal columns. More heavily shade the total columns.

Need transparencies of materials that are to be filled out.

Make materials less unwieldy. A booklet answer sheet would be easier to handle and evaluate.

Forms should be made clearer. Wording should be at the student level in all areas.

Columns, boxes, etc need to be marked by darker lines to separate columns, etc.

Simplify forms and change some of the terms such as "skilled tongue" to "skilled in speech."

Put materials in booklet and use machine scorable answer sheets.

Instead of the extra long sheets, more sheets with larger spaces for work.
Eliminate student handbook. Instead of the handbook, need duplicate tables and forms into one packet.

More tangible materials for the students--they need some kind of results they can see.

Correct language errors in forms and update for U.S. students.

Use red and blue pencils rather then pens since students make mistakes or want to change their minds.

Summary Profile Sheet should have lines for every number--students like to be exact.
Show students what scores mean.

Computerize Forms A and B.

Forms are clumsy to explain. Columns too long. Could be color coded or vertical lines made bold.

Counselors

In Form A, I would suggest putting the grid at the top of that page, somewhere in the middle, and again at the bottom to make it easier to understand.

In Form B, there are too many statements in column 2 that are ambiguous and need clarification, e.g., #18 you are enthusiastic in doing things--it depends on what kinds of things you are talking about!!!

Summary Profile Sheet needs to have hash marks down the line right to the left of the # of activities columns. Without them it is extremely difficult to figure out the Personality Tendency and Appropriate Occupations column. I also would have liked to see the instructions for filling out both forms written out word-for-word in the guidelines for teachers and counselors. As it is both of the books are exactly the same.

An easier scoring system for the validation part of Form B.

Revise forms to include more typical American terminology.

Need a section in teacher's guide on data interpretation.

Career choices need updating and modified to Western culture.

Machine scoring needed--scoring by hand very difficult and time consuming.

Need more follow-up resources and activity suggestions.

More time should be spent on "payoff," i.e. how to address deficiencies and what to do next.

There should be a correlation of this data with U.S. Labor Department breakdown of skills needed for specific jobs.

Forms are confusing. Columns need to be color coded and unused blocks left out.

Instruction book is very confusing to students.

Materials need clarification of Occupations (practical nurse, general nurse, etc.). Clarification on personality train--sensitive hands.

Form A is cumbersome. Perhaps a booklet form with 2-3 categories on a page would be more manageable.

Data interpretation is too open ended. Some guidelines are needed. What is significant.

Principals

Form B. Index #1 should be noted on the form.

Scoring is too involved. Maybe get it on Quick Score answer sheets. Shorten Form A.

Correct spelling and heading errors.

Revise to reflect American student activities.

Directions for Forms A and B should be on one page and not on sheets in book.
Students are not able to follow all those directions. They must be shown step by step. That would make it more self-directive.